Case 1:14-cv-02863-CM Document 46 Filed 05/08/14 Page 1 of 2

Case 1:14-cv-02863-CM Document 41 Filed 05/07/14 Page 1 of 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

WEND ENDURSEL

100

BENJAMIN M. LAWSKY, Superintendent of Financial Services of the State of New York,

Case No.: 14-CV-2863 (CM)

Plaintiff,

Denied. I do not

v.

can make there

CONDOR CAPITAL CORPORATION and STEPHEN BARON,

orgunates at the

Defendants.

heaving on Mon

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SURREPLY TO DEFENDANTS REPLY MEMORANDUM

Defendants Condor Capital Corporation ("Condor") and Stephen Baron (together with Condor, "Defendants"), by and through their undersigned counsel, respectfully submit this Motion for leave to file a Surreply in response to Plaintiff's reply Memorandum of Law. The filing of a Surreply is within a Court's discretion if necessary to "permit comprehensive adjudication of the issues raised." *See Correspondent Servs. Corp. v. JVW Inv., Ltd.*, No. 99 Civ. 8934, 2004 WL 2181087 (S.D.N.Y. 2004). The filing of a Surreply is most appropriate when there is a new issue raised in movant's reply papers. *See, e.g., Lee v. Coughlin*, 26 F. Supp. 2d 615 (S.D.N.Y. 1988) (granting plaintiff the right to a Surreply because of a new issue); *Pony Pal LLC v. Claire's Boutique, Inc.*, 05 Civ. 2355, 2006 WL 2827642 (Oct. 2, 2006) (granting filing of Surreply); *ResQNET.Com, Inc. v. Lansa, Inc.*, 382 F. Supp. 2d 424 (S.D.N.Y. 2005) (same).

Here, Plaintiffs have set forth new facts in two declarations submitted with their reply memorandum, both of which Defendants dispute: first, that the overpayments due customers Case 1:14-cv-02863-CM Document 46 Filed 05/08/14 Page 2 of 2

Case 1:14-cv-02863-CM Document 41 Filed 05/07/14 Page 2 of 2

from Condor is almost \$11 million; and second that Condor has not attempted to comply with the

TRO. Both of these statements are not true and thus Plaintiff's respectfully request leave to file a

very short Surreply to these specific, new allegations. The Surreply includes a short

memorandum from counsel and a second declaration of Todd Baron only addressing these

specific contentions. Defendants have attached the proposed filing as Appendix A if the Court

would allow the Surreply to be filed.

Dated: May 7, 2014

New York, New York

By: /s/ Michael M. Rosensaft

Michael M. Rosensaft Leah Mary Campbell

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP 575 Madison Avenue New York, New York 10022-2585 (212) 940-8800

Attorneys for Defendants

2